1	Eugene B. Elliot, State Bar No. 111475 Ethan M. Lowry, State Bar No. 278831 Kate L. Brown, State Bar No. 308134		
$\begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{bmatrix}$			
$\begin{vmatrix} 2 \\ 3 \end{vmatrix}$	BERTRAND, FOX, ELLIOT, OSMAN & WENZEL The Waterfront Building 2749 Hyde Street San Francisco, California 94109 Telephone: (415) 353-0999 Facsimile: (415) 353-0990 Email: eelliot@bfesf.com		
4			
5			
6	Email. <u>eemot@biesr.com</u>		
7	Attorneys for Defendant SANTA ROSA CITY SCHOOLS		
8			
9			
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
11	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
12	JANE DOE NO. 59,	Case No. 3:16-cv-01256-WHO	
13	Plaintiff,	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE	
14		FACT AND EXPERT DISCOVERY CUTOFF	
15	V.		
16	SANTA ROSA CITY SCHOOLS,		
17	Defendants.		
18	AND RELATED CROSS-ACTION.	Hon. William H. Orrick	
19			
20	STIPULATION		
21	Defendant SANTA ROSA CITY SCHOOLS (the "DISTRICT") and plaintiff JANE DOE NO. 5		
22	by and through their respective attorneys of record, hereby stipulate as follows:		
23	1. The Court assigned a Fact Discovery cutoff date of February 14, 2017. Trial is set for		
24	August 14, 2017.		
25	2. The Parties were originally assigned a settlement conference date of November 30, 201		
26	with Magistrate Judge Maria-Elena James. On November 28, 2016, Magistrate James granted the		
27	parties' request to continue the settlement conference to January 20, 2017 due to the unavailability of		

persons with settlement authority on behalf of the DISTRICT. On January 19, 2017, Magistrate James

STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE FACT AND EXPERT DISCOVERY CUTOFF USDC Case No.: 3:16-cv-01256-WHO

vacated the settlement conference due to concerns regarding protests at the Federal Courthouse. The settlement conference was then re-set for February 9, 2017. The case did not settle at that time, and a further settlement conference has been set for June 12, 2017 with Magistrate James.

- 3. The Parties had intended to minimize the costs and expenses of litigation by engaging in limited discovery before the settlement conference. Because the case did not resolve at the settlement conference, both parties require additional time to complete discovery.
- 4. The DISTRICT intends to conduct the following further discovery: (1) complete the deposition of Mother DOE; (2) depose Father DOE; (3) depose DOE's school and private counselors; (4) depose further witnesses; (5) conduct a psychological examination of DOE (which plaintiff's counsel has stipulated to); and (6) propound additional written discovery.

DOE intends to conduct the following further discovery: (1) depose Defendant's District Representative(s) in accordance with Rule 30(b)(6); (2) depose further fact witnesses; (3) review Defendant's forthcoming responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests; and (4) conduct potential additional discovery necessitated by forthcoming responses to Plaintiff's discovery requests.

- 6. The parties therefore respectfully request that the Court extend the Fact Discovery cutoff date 60 days to April 10, 2017. This extension will not affect the trial date or any other dates previously set by the Court. In fact, the parties' stipulation of extending the Fact Discovery cutoff is contingent on such an extension not affecting the trial date.
- 7. Further, Plaintiff's Motion to Compel Production of Complete Juvenile Case File for C.E. (DE 54) is still pending. In the event this Court grants Plaintiff's unopposed Motion, Plaintiff anticipates that the production of the Case File may provide for further discovery, as well.
- 8. Expert Disclosure is currently set for March 14, 2017. Expert rebuttal is set for April 14, 2017. Expert discovery cutoff is set for May 15, 2017.
- 9. The parties respectfully request that the Court extend the Expert Discovery deadlines 30 days as follows: (1) Expert Disclosure: April 14, 2017; (2) Expert rebuttal: May 15, 2017; (3) Expert Discovery cutoff: June 15, 2017. This extension will not affect the trial date or any other dates previously set by the Court. In fact, the parties' stipulation of extending the Discovery cutoff is contingent on such an extension not affecting the trial date.

## Case 3:16-cv-01256-WHO Document 57 Filed 02/13/17 Page 3 of 5

1	10. The parties respectfully request that the Court approve this stipulation and incorporate it		
2	terms in an Order.		
3 4	Dated: February 13, 2017 BERTRAND, FOX, ELLIOT, OSMAN & WENZEL		
5	Den /-/ Ed I seem		
6 7	By: <u>/s/Ethan Lowry</u> Eugene B. Elliot		
	Ethan M. Lowry Kate L. Brown		
8 9	Attorneys for Defendant SANTA ROSA CITY SCHOOLS		
10 11	Dated: February 13, 2017 HERMAN LAW		
12	By:/s/Arick Fudali		
13	Arick Fudali, Esq. (Calf. Bar No. 296364)		
14	Daniel G. Ellis, Esq. (Calf. Bar No. 298639) Attorneys for Plaintiff		
15	JANE DOE NO. 59		
16			
17	ATTORNEY ATTESTATION		
18	I hereby attest that I have on file all holograph signatures for any signatures indicated by a		
19			
20			
21			
22	Dated: February 13, 2017  By:/s/ Ethan Lowry  Ethan M. Lowry		
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
•	3		
	STIPULATION AND ORDER TO CONTINUE FACT AND EXPERT DISCOVERY CUTOFF		

. .

**ORDER** 

GOOD CAUSE APPEARING THEREFORE, and the parties' having stipulated to the same, the parties' stipulation is hereby APPROVED. The Fact Discovery cutoff currently set for February 14, 2017 is continued 60 days to April 10, 2017. This extension will not alter or affect the trial date or any other dates previously set by the Court.

Expert Discovery deadlines are continued 30 days as follows: (1) Expert Disclosure: April 14, 2017; (2) Expert rebuttal: May 15, 2017; (3) Expert Discovery cutoff: June 15, 2017. This extension will not affect the trial date or any other dates previously set by the Court.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 13, 2017

W. W. Qe

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, the undersigned, declare that I am employed in the County of San Francisco, California; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within cause; and my business address is 2749 Hyde Street, San Francisco, California 94109.

I am readily familiar with the practice of Bertrand, Fox, Elliot, Osman & Wenzel with respect to the collection and processing of pleadings, discovery documents, motions and all other documents which must be served upon opposing parties or other counsel in litigation. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

On **February 13, 2017**, I served the following document:

## STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO CONTINUE FACT AND EXPERT **DISCOVERY CUTOFF**

on the following interested parties:

Ramon Espinosa Norma Espinosa 2426 Quail Hollow Drive Santa Rosa, California 95403

Pro Se Cross-Defendants

Said service was performed in the following manner:

**(√)** BY U.S. POSTAL SERVICE (Mail): I placed each such document in a sealed envelope addressed at noted above, with first-class mail postage thereon fully prepaid, for collection and mailing at San Francisco, California, following the above-stated business practice, on this date.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed February 13, 2017, at San Francisco, California.

> /s/ L Roberts L Roberts